

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, MAY 24, 1913

No. 28

In this issue we print a paper delivered at the meeting of The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland during the last Thanksgiving vacation by Principal J. H. Denbigh of the Morris High School of New York City. Such a paper deserves careful consideration as the utterance of one whose primary concern is education in the large, and whose view therefore extends beyond the narrow limits of any single department. It is significant that such an administrator is willing to canvass the field of Latin teaching so thoroughly, and this should add weight to his words, even if we may not be disposed to accept all his conclusions.

It is to be remembered, as I emphasized before (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.49), that the success of any teacher does not depend wholly upon his ability and skill. So when we speak of success we do not always have the teacher in mind. I know of one teacher whose classroom is so noisy from the proximity of a railroad that she can often not be heard; I know another who has now a beginning class of 55 pupils. Success and efficiency are two different things.

Mr. Denbigh's figures show a decrease in the proportion of students taking the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board in Cicero and Vergil, as compared with other subjects. I imagine this holds good throughout the country, although it is hard to be certain, and some observers maintain that Latin is gaining at the expense of other subjects. Professor Kelsey's statistics showed 50.29 per cent of all the pupils in secondary schools taking Latin in 1898-1899, 49.96 per cent in 1903-1904, and 49.59 per cent in 1909-1910. But even if this decrease in proportion is true, as I believe to be the case, is it any genuine cause for depression? Emphatically not. For even the statistics of Mr. Denbigh show a considerable absolute increase, and this likewise holds good elsewhere. Professor Knapp has secured from the Department of Education at Albany the following figures of those taking the Regents' examinations in Cicero and Vergil in June from 1907 to 1912: Cicero, 778,1885, 2219,2432,2754,2804; Vergil, 187,532,588,683,776,816. Complete statistics of the total number taking all examinations are not available, but that is not im-

portant. The important fact is the large absolute increase. In fact it would be cause for gratification if this increase were not so large, for there is an element of weakness here to which we should be alive.

We teachers should urge certain considerations upon both parents and school authorities. First of all, it is neither desirable nor right that all pupils should study Latin. Those who have no natural bent for languages should not. Then, many pupils, who for various reasons, frequently social ones, do take Latin, are prevented from being successful by various outside demands. This is especially true in private schools. Such failure does not lie at the door either of Latin or of Latin teaching. Further, many pupils who would profit greatly from Latin are forced by circumstances to turn their efforts into other channels. This is not in itself a bad thing, and the loss of such pupils should also not lie at the door of Latin or of Latin teaching. Then, too, the conditions under which Latin is taught in many places are most unfavorable to proper results. This is not brought out with any insistence in Mr. Denbigh's paper, and in fact it is characteristic of many administrators to pass lightly over this fact. And yet in many cases the failure of a child in Latin, as in other subjects, can be traced directly not to eye-strain or poor nourishment but to overcrowding in class-rooms, and to poorly trained teachers, employed because the efficient teacher is much more expensive.

As long, then, as our numbers really increase, or even remain steady, we have no reason to complain, but we likewise are not justified in being so satisfied with the situation as to take no steps to hold these presumably better pupils who are now thronging our classes. If we see faults either of administration or teaching we should try to correct them. If new methods are suggested we should test them freely and adequately, and if they are found to be better, we should adopt them. In all our efforts we should remember that the heads of our schools are potent as allies or as foes. They frequently get a much better perspective than we do. If they are wrong we must enlighten them, but we must not always be so sure that we can get no light from them. It is fortunate for Latin, as for edu-

cation in general, that so many of the principals of our large schools are so ready to co-operate with us. The meeting at Philadelphia at which Mr. Denbigh spoke gave ample evidence of that, and the whole tenor of his paper showed the same thing.

G. L.

**TO WHAT CAUSES, WHETHER PEDAGOGICAL
OR ADMINISTRATIVE OR BOTH, IS DUE
THE PERSISTENT LACK OF SUC-
CESS IN THE TEACHING
OF THE CLASSICS?**

The form of this question is not of my own choosing. It is rather of the type of the famous inquiry *Have you ceased to beat your wife?*, but, since it has been allotted to me for discussion, I shall attempt to discover what grounds there may be for proposing it at all, fortified by the belief that teachers of classical languages are not pusillanimous enough to fear frankness or pessimistic enough to be hurt by it.

Many teachers of Latin and Greek will protest at once that, although circumstantial evidence may be strong against them, there is no persistent lack of success in present-day classical teaching, but that, on the contrary, considering all the adverse conditions they are called upon to meet, they are achieving as much or even more success than are the teachers of other subjects.

To such protests the opposition may counter by inquiring What means, then, the disappearance of Greek from your schools the moment it ceased to be a college-protected industry? Why do from twenty-five to thirty per cent of your students fail of school promotion from year to year or from term to term in Latin? Why do incoming students exhibit an apparently increasing aversion to elect Latin in School and College courses? Why do College professors complain of a lack of thoroughness in preparation in the classical languages? How do you account for the fact that even among College entrance candidates the relative proportion of those entering with Latin is rapidly decreasing?

All sharp home thrusts, these, but fair questions and deserving of a reply.

That teaching is certainly successful which makes or tends to make students observant, careful, analytic, contemplative and studious, says one of my colleagues, and surely this cannot be gainsaid. No one speaking with any knowledge of the subject—not even the most rabid iconoclast, I think—will deny that the study of the classical languages tends to the inculcation and cultivation of all of these highly desirable habits of mind. It must also be conceded that acquisition to a moderate degree of these mental qualities by a student in whom they were to begin with conspicuously lacking may very properly be counted a more successful piece of

work, relatively, than their very highest realization by a student in whom they were originally marked natural gifts.

In other words we must not allow ourselves or others, in an overintrospective mood of discouragement, to estimate success solely by the number of accurate, finished and polished classical scholars we may turn out, but on the contrary we must remember—and remind our critics—that much of the most valuable work we have done and ever will do is done, or to be done, with students who may not complete even a secondary school course in Latin or Greek.

To forget this would indeed be to confuse the end with the means—to forget that it is mind training after all that we are trying to accomplish in the Schools rather than to teach a dead language.

But if a training in classical languages be good—and some among us believe it to be the best possible,—then it is important that as many students as possible should have this training, and that it should be continued as long as the student is plainly deriving benefit from it.


If we hold to this proposition, and I think we must, we are bound to consider the indictment of 'persistent lack of success' as at least not unreasonable, especially when we remember that within a comparatively short time we have seen Greek disappear almost entirely from our School courses and now see the study of Latin threatened. We may not refuse, at least, to plead to the indictment, shouldering whatever may be our share of the blame, but no whit more than that.

At a dinner of the Head Masters' Association a few years ago Mr. William C. Collar made a remark to the effect that in twenty years we might live to see Latin go the way of Greek. The apparent pessimism of such a statement from a classical teacher of such eminence made some of those who heard him gasp with astonishment not unmixed with incredulity. If that statement, however, were to be made to-day for the first time, it is probable that some of those who then regarded it as very unlikely of fulfilment would assent—grudgingly, perhaps—but still assent to it.

It was with Mr. Collar's remark in mind that I recently endeavored to find out from reliable data what might be the actual trend of things. Of course the most desirable statistics would have been accurate figures, extending over many years, as to the number of students actually studying Latin and Greek in our secondary schools¹, but, these not being obtainable, the next best thing appeared to be to find out what was being done by students who were candidates for admission to College. Accordingly the twelve reports issued by the College Entrance Examination Board since its in-

¹ For statistics on this point see F. W. Kelsey, Latin and Greek in American Education, 1-16.

ception were consulted and the percentages of the whole number of candidates each year who took (1) Cicero, (2) Vergil, (3) Xenophon, (4) Homer, (5) Intermediate German, or (6) Intermediate French were calculated and rough graphs plotted to present the situation more clearly at a glance.



The Xenophon graph is a steadily descending line beginning in 1901 with something over 14 per cent taking the subject and ending in 1912 with less than four per cent who presented it.

The graph representing the Homer situation is roughly parallel of course to the former, beginning in 1901 with something over 11 per cent and ending in 1912 with rather more than two per cent. Here are losses in twelve years of 10 and 9 per cent in round numbers of those presenting Xenophon and Homer respectively.

The Latin curves showed more fluctuation than the Greek, but, alas! their general trend is decidedly downward. The Cicero graph falls, after two sharp rises, from 32.4 per cent to 28.2 per cent.

In Vergil the descent is even more marked—with but three slight intermediate rises, from 27.9 per cent to 19.2 per cent, a difference only 0.6 of one per cent less than the decrease in the percentage of Homer candidates during the twelve years.

Here, indeed, is food for reflection. We have

become inured to the pain of the inevitable parting with Homer, but it has not been so generally realized that within another twelve years Vergil may stand where Homer stood twelve years ago. If, then, it be lack of success to fail to keep up the relative numbers of those studying Latin for entrance to College, we surely have persistently failed.

For entrance to College—at least so far as the degree in Arts is concerned—Latin is still a very carefully protected industry. If the decrease in relative numbers of those taking it be true of College entrance candidates, it is fair to assume that within the past twelve years there must have been a still greater relative decrease in the number of secondary school students who were not going to College engaged in the study of the language, for, very generally, a school diploma may be obtained by taking alternative subjects which appear, at least, in content more applicable to the activities of the market place, activities too often called 'real life' (as if they were or ever could be life's sum total), by pedagogical progressives of the most radical type.

If we believe that we have in Latin and in Greek the best instruments for educational training it is our bounden duty to do all that we can to demonstrate the fact. Decreasing numbers may be indicative of many things, e.g. decreasing interest, a growing disbelief that the usefulness of the subject is commensurate with the effort necessary for success, lack of previous training to concentrated effort, etc. Whatever may be the real reasons it behoves us, if we would be defenders of the faith that is ours, to examine all possible causes in order that we as teachers, so far as in us lies, may remove them.

Had I unlimited time I have neither the insight nor the ability necessary to make a thoroughly comprehensive list of the factors which militate against the most successful teaching of classical languages in these days, but from my own experience and from suggestions made to me by my colleagues in the Morris High School at my request I am inclined to classify causes which hamper us under the following headings: (1) Administrative; (2) Pedagogical; (3) Pedagogical in part, but dependent also to some extent upon the personal equation of the teacher or the student or both; (4) Causes arising out of character weakness and unfavorable or even positively inimical home conditions; (5) Influence of present-day clamor for subjects obviously and immediately applicable to everyday life—the old controversy as to subject-content versus training or disciplinary value; (6) Causes inherent in Latin itself.

From this point on, unless Greek is specifically mentioned, what I may say is to be taken as referring particularly to Latin.

(1) Under the first heading, administrative

causes, the first to be mentioned is one distinctive of Latin teaching in the United States.

We do not begin the study soon enough. Even with the best and most intelligent teaching there is of necessity so much mere memory work in the acquisition of a new language that it stands to reason we should undertake the work when the constant memorizing is least irksome and that we should proceed more slowly at first than we now attempt to proceed. This earlier beginning of the subject would mean differentiation of courses in public elementary schools—a change in general policy which might for other reasons be exceedingly desirable.

Another and very real difficulty to the beginning student in Latin is found in the crowded secondary school programme of to-day. Fewer subjects and better work in each of them ought to be the rule.

Public secondary schools—especially the larger—are subject to re-organization at least once a year and many of them twice a year. With their complicated programmes a frequent change of teacher results in a lack of knowledge of the individual student's personality and his peculiar weaknesses and thereby contributes in no small degree to the ultimate failure of weak pupils.

A fourth administrative cause is found in the very human instinct of the pupil to follow the line of least resistance. He finds that French, for instance—although comparatively it is what he himself describes as a 'cinch'—will give him as many credits as Greek for College entrance or as Latin for a School diploma and so he elects the easier work. The graphs for Intermediate French and German in the College Entrance Examination Board tests show no signs of the regular downward tendency of those indicative of the Greek and Latin situation. The curve for Intermediate French rises from 11.4 per cent presenting the subject in 1901 to 17 per cent presenting the subject in 1912. In German the corresponding figures are 12.9 per cent and 15.5 per cent respectively.

(2) First among pedagogical reasons for lack of success may be mentioned teaching less skillful than it might be—teaching that is in reality mere quizzing and hearing of set tasks. The more I see of teaching the more convinced do I become that few teachers realize the tremendous distinction between true teaching and hearing lessons. This constant lesson-hearing seems to have for its highest aim the teaching of the elements of the subject—I do not think that Latin teachers are either more or less to blame in this respect than other teachers—rather than the development of a student's ability to think and to discriminate.

But while some teachers undoubtedly do too much drill, making their recitations wearisome and monotonous by it, others do too little and the last

state of these is worse than that of the others.

Another of our besetting sins is to attempt to do too much in the first year's work—too many forms, too much syntax and the memorizing of vocabularies that are too long. Sometimes bewilderment, discouragement, and eventual failure come to students because too sharp a transition has been made from first to second year work. With the skillfully written books available nowadays there seems to be no excuse for this and a good teacher should find no difficulty in making the line of demarcation between the work of the two years practically unnoticeable.

I think that in the past we have wearied and deadened our teachers and students by reading too much Caesar and Cicero day after day. I do not believe that even the most enthusiastic teacher of Latin could maintain that his pupils were themselves ever really enthusiastic about the content of the selections read from either author. We ought to read other and more varied selections of about the same or even less difficulty. The new College Entrance Examination Board requirements should produce in the hands of a good teacher a very different attitude on the part of students toward the content of the selections read in the second and the third years of their course.

The beginner has been, and even now is, confused by the different terminology in use in English and Latin grammar and syntax. I had supposed that ignorance of English grammar was a potent cause of failure in Latin—at least in the public school students—but as proficiency in this subject has grown the failures have not correspondingly decreased. The failures which may be traced to lack of thorough preparation in English grammar indicate that more thorough drill is required on mood, tense, and voice than is generally given. It is clear, for instance, that if a student does not understand the passive voice in English he is going to make many unnecessary mistakes before he can use it correctly in Latin.

I believe that a certain lack of emphasis upon Sight Translation throughout the course has resulted very generally in a failure to secure for the average student any consciousness of power to read easy unprepared Latin. I am convinced that if such work is carried on regularly from the very beginnings of the subject the ability to read an 'unseen' passage from the works of authors of the difficulty of Caesar, Cicero or Vergil may very surely be acquired. Perhaps the most important thing in doing sight translation is to accustom the student to the idea that under no circumstances whatever must he allow himself to write down words which have no meaning. It is with sight translation as it is with geometry. The handing in of a blank sheet may be the first indication of real progress—that the student knows enough to know that he does

not know. That he may cultivate the habit of writing good sense or nothing at all, the student should be given much very easy Latin for sight translation.

In our American classical courses composition is very little emphasized and I think very properly so, considering the amount of work we try to do and the time in which we have to do it, but it seems to me that we ought to make a more regular practice of turning back into Latin a translation which has been made by the student from Latin into English. I say this remembering full well that Roger Ascham is dead, and the Elizabethan era past. I say it because I believe that by regular practice in such work we could get without great expenditure of time most of the good that comes from constructive exercise in language.

(3) Of causes working against successful teaching there is one that may be classed as partly pedagogical and partly dependent on the personalities of teacher and student. This is the joint result of the inability of some instructors to teach their students how to study and the varying degrees of reaction that students make to efforts made to give them that power.

Teaching a student how to study for himself is the most important mental accomplishment we can give him. His elementary work has often been conducted along lines that did not give a training in concentration—his poor visualization of a word, for instance, which meant poor spelling in English means far more than that in an inflected language—and unless we show him the right way to go about his task, unless we take care that the task is well within his power to perform and then exact its performance, he will flounder for a while and then fail miserably.

(4) So far we have laid all the burdens of non-success on the school and the teacher. There is a part of it, however, which must be placed elsewhere.

We should be blind to real conditions if we did not realize, and say plainly, that many students do not have sufficient moral stamina to do a hard thing and we do not pretend for a moment that Latin is easy. Many of the pupils are downright indolent, even those of good mental ability, and for these we can scarcely accept a full responsibility. Once we have brought all our ingenuity and all the available machinery of the School to bear on such cases, we may succeed in exacting the set task, and we should be content with no less, but we shall not, from such students, obtain the full measure of success of which they are capable. The children of to-day rule their parents to too great an extent, and home co-operation is not always to be had. Elizabeth, for instance, enters High School. She thinks she is going to College and takes Latin. Father and mother are willing she should go to College. Elizabeth discovers that Latin is hard;

she fails in a term's work in it and must repeat. Now she teases her parents to let her drop it; she has changed her mind, she is not going to College anyhow and what's the good of Latin unless you're going to College? What good, indeed? says father. By all means let her drop it if it worries her! And so another failure in Latin is scored against us not altogether because of our own shortcomings but because Elizabeth rules at home. And what Elizabeth did this year brother Tom will do next. And this is not the worst of it. The worst of it is that there are two active little missionaries abroad preaching against Latin to other Toms and Elizabeths, their text being 'Don't take Latin; it's hard'.

(5) Another very potent factor in the situation is the present-day insistence upon subjects which are obviously and immediately applicable to everyday life. This influence is strong—it has very much of right upon its side—but it usually takes no account of the very important truth that a training which gives certain habits of mind is far more important than the acquisition of some facts closely related to life as life is expressed in the single activity of bread winning.

(6) And then, too, Latin is not without its own inherent difficulties. Those of us who can recollect our own beginnings in the subject will remember how difficult the inflections seemed to us. What a poor arrangement it seemed to be to have to change the ending of a word in order to express a variation in meaning that in English we so easily expressed by a preposition or some other useful little word. And then, too, many things showed up so clearly in Latin that we never had to think about in English—gender, number and case in adjectives, for instance. And we missed our comfortable little personal pronouns which in some mysterious way had been made a part of the verb.

Oh, yes, Latin is hard in the beginning. But I am inclined to believe that we might add a great deal of interest to it and make it all very much easier for children if we devoted from a fifth to a third of our time to teaching it by the Direct Method during the first year. Decidedly the most interested class I have seen recently was one engaged in hearing and telling the story of *The House that Jack Built*. They were really *enjoying* Latin. By concrete examples, by participation in the simplest childish drama, by repeated action suited to the word, they were fixing in their minds word-endings and syntactical relations by methods which made them very real to them.

But although in the dawn of the Direct Method we may step down into this cold gray valley of first year Latin with all the fervor of a latter day Ezekiel upon us, rattle the dry bones there, lay sinews upon them and bring up flesh upon them, we shall not even then have made the dead to live.

It will still be needful that for the consummation of the miracle we should breathe into our work the breath of life from the four winds—the spirit of the qualified, skillful and enthusiastic teacher.

The Direct Method is not an easy method for teachers—badly prepared teachers could not use it at all. It is not going to be a universal panacea for our ills, but with wise and skillful teachers it is going to supplement older methods where they are weakest. Mr. Barss of the Hotchkiss School recently summed up the matter very neatly for most of us when he said of himself and his use of the method that he was "somewhat in the position of a boy with his first razor who knows that people do shave with such things but also knows that the unwary cut themselves therewith. Still he did learn to shave and so he is cautiously but hopefully experimenting with this new edged tool in education".

If we are in accord as to the actual existence and effect of causes which I have cited and which, to me and to some of my colleagues seem real and weighty, it will not be necessary for me to dwell long upon means of removing or modifying them. The very statement of most of them implies the remedy. To say, for instance, that we begin Latin too late in the school course suggests at once the necessary change in the curriculum.

To me the conclusion of the whole matter seems to be this—that our lack of success is apparently demonstrated by a decrease in the number of students taking the subject and by a lamentably large number of failures in it. To meet both these conditions we must insist upon the best kind of teaching and conditions under which such teaching is possible. Teachers who are fitted by scholarship and alert, sympathetic, resourceful temperament, classes not overlarge, methods that will make abstract things more real to children, a more determined effort to teach students how to study, persistent efforts to train and develop habits of concentration and judgment—these things will tend to success. The sense of power to do the work will insure that it is done well by students, and when we have succeeded in cultivating this sense of power we need not fear that classical studies will vanish from our School courses. We are at a place where we are well advised to take account of ourselves and our work.

This done and the necessary readjustments made—and they will not be easy—we may disregard overpessimistic or incompetent critics of our work. We may proceed with hope and confidence to give with greater efficiency the training in powers of observation, analysis, logical discrimination and concentration which we believe to be the concomitant of intelligent study of the classical languages.

JOHN H. DENBIGH.

MORRIS HIGH SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY.

REVIEW

A Source Book of Ancient History. By George Willis Botsford and Lillie Shaw Botsford. New York: The Macmillan Company (1912). Pp. 594.

Teachers of ancient history are once more indebted to these editors for a valuable book. In presenting translations of source material they have made possible good teaching in ancient history as well as in modern history. The Source Book of Ancient History is intended as an auxiliary to Botsford's History of the Ancient World and so has material grouped into subjects and chapters corresponding to those in the text-book, but it is valuable as a source book for any study of ancient history. The book does not claim to be the only source book on Greek and Roman history, but it includes a more varied amount of material and has the unique merit of rendering Oriental sources available. Standard translations are used where such are to be found.

There are three main divisions to the book, dealing with Oriental nations, Hellas, and Rome. To each there is a brief introduction giving an account of the sources quoted, the nature of the source, the date, and generally some brief estimate (if it be a literary source). Besides the introductions there are many explanations of particular points in the margins of the text. These introductions do not claim to be complete, but they give enough information for an intelligent use of the sources, and the more advanced students are advised to consult various histories of literature. The introduction to Oriental history is brief and confines itself to a description of the kind of sources used. The introduction to Greek sources is more detailed and takes up each source separately. The character of these sources is varied, including inscriptions and papyri as well as literary accounts. One could wish that there had been room for a selection from one of the Logographers (because students are apt to think that history began full-grown with Herodotus), and from Lysias and Isocrates. The introduction to sources of Roman history has plenty of valuable material but might be presented in a more attractive form, especially the first half of it.

At the end of each chapter there is a list of questions to aid the student in getting the facts from the quotations. Usually these questions are helpful, but in a few instances they become trivial (compare the questions about Catullus on page 463, those about Augustus on page 479). The purpose of these questions is not to determine the right or the wrong, the wisdom or the folly of an action, but to determine what is relevant and irrelevant, what is fact and what opinion, and to determine relationships. Historical criticism, in its narrow sense, is avoided because the editors think it too difficult for students below University grade.

The selections are from a wide range of material. To illustrate, one might take the age of Pericles: the selections include extracts from Plutarch's Pericles, Sophocles's Electra, Antigone, Oedipus Tyrannus, Aristophanes's Wasps and Acharnians, Thucydides, Constitution of Athens, an epitaph, a letter, and inscriptions. On the period of the revolution at Rome there is material from Plutarch, Appian, Florus, Cicero, Caesar, Suetonius, Catullus, Lucretius, Propertius, an inscription (the Lex Municipalis). Of these quotations the one from Catullus seems least good because it does not give his best work.

The sources to illustrate the history of the Empire do not cover the period completely but they give representative material and show the main events and movements of the time. This course seems much wiser than trying to crowd in everything that has a bearing on the history of the Empire. Different editors might include various other selections, especially some from Martial, and omit certain ones found in this book, but the choice of material is usually very good indeed.

Enough has been said to show that the book is excellent for classes of several different grades. With the help given by the questions classes of beginners can find some profit in it, while the possibilities open to more mature classes depend on the teacher. There is enough material for use in college classes, but its greatest usefulness will be in preparatory schools. It brings within the power of the student the use of source-material before he is able to make such translations for himself, and it should give him a new interest in things Greek and Roman. To many whose only acquaintance with classical literature is through Caesar's Gallic War and Cicero's Catilinarian Orations and a little of Vergil and Sallust it will prove a revelation of how human and interesting the ancients were. But more valuable still, it makes possible the study of ancient history in a way that trains the judgment as well as the memory. For that reason alone the book should be found in all classes of ancient history in preparatory schools.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

J. F. FERGUSON.

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The Classical Club of Philadelphia held its final meeting of the current academic year on April 10, completing the eighteenth year of its existence. The officers elected for the ensuing year are President, Professor Walton B. McDaniel, of the University of Pennsylvania; Vice President, Professor Walter Dennison, of Swarthmore College; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Benjamin W. Mitchell, of the Central High School.

Six papers were read before the club during the year, as follows: in November, Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy, by Professor Tenney Frank, of Bryn Mawr College; in December, The Noises of Ancient Rome, by Professor Guy B. Colburn, of the University of Missouri (read by the Secretary in the absence of the author); in January, The Monasteries of Meteora, by Professor Walter W. Hyde, of the University of Pennsylvania; in February, Classical Sources in Elizabethan Drama, by Professor Felix E. Schelling of the University of Pennsylvania; in March, Tityretus, Ancient and Yet More Ancient, by Professor Walter B. McDaniel, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Parallels to the Circe Legend of the Odyssey in Vijaya's Conquest of Ceylon, by Dr. E. W. Burlingame, of the Haverford Grammar School; in April, The Political Principles of Cicero, by Professor David Magie, Jr., of Princeton University. The membership of the Club for the year was fifty-seven.

B. W. MITCHELL, Secretary.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The Classical Association of Southern California has just completed its eighteenth year of vigorous life, writes Mr. Walter A. Edwards, Head of the

Classical Department of the High School at Los Angeles. At a meeting held March 8, 75 persons were present, and there was the greatest enthusiasm and interest. We have space only to give the titles of the papers: The Rouse Method of Teaching Latin, A Roman Room and A Roman Dinner, A Latin Club, Here and There in Latium, Virgil's Georgics.

The Council of Manchester University (Manchester, England) has established a second Professorship of Latin, in addition to that held by Professor R. S. Conway. The province of the new chair will be the Latin literature and inscriptions of the Roman empire, including the records of the Roman dominion in Britain. It is the first professorship of this subject, which has been largely developed by recent research, established in any university, and no other British university yet possesses a second chair of Latin.—From the *Manchester Guardian*.

Recently, Professor Perley Oakland Place, President of The New York State Classical Teachers' Association, has been issuing various documents in the interest of that Association. One of these, a brief statement prepared by Professor Frank Smalley, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Syracuse University, we have just space enough, fortunately, to quote in this closing issue:

"A stale teacher inspires little or no interest in his subject. Pupils quickly detect the defect. A live teacher is generally an inspiring teacher. Intense interest in his subject and great enthusiasm characterize him. He is always seeking new points and additional information to broaden his view. An excellent method for a teacher of Classics is to have on hand at all times some outside work. A teacher of Caesar might profitably use a little time in reading Caesar's Civil War or Nepos's Biographies. Together with Cicero might go readings in Livy or Tacitus. With Vergil the teacher might read Ovid's Metamorphoses or Lucretius. Horace is a never-ending source of delight to his readers. Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus are available. If the teacher has read portions of these authors in College, there will be a greater pleasure in perusing other portions. In a few years he could read widely in the field of Roman literature, and how much better qualified would he be for his work as a teacher."

Among recent volumes in the Loeb Classical Library are translations of Lucian, Volume I, by Professor A. M. Harmon, of Princeton University, which has been highly praised, with justice, by the reviewers, and Julian, Volume I, by Professor Wilmer Cave Wright (Mrs. Wright), of Bryn Mawr College.

Members of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and subscribers to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY may obtain missing numbers of Volume VI by writing to the Business Manager, before June 6, and sending a one-cent stamp for each number desired.

Attention is called to the fact that back volumes of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY may be obtained at \$1.00 per volume. A complete set of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY gives one access to an important set of editorials, papers, etc., on various aspects of the teaching of the Classics and to a very important collection of reviews of classical books, in the field of College and University work no less than in the domain of the High School.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 119th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editor

ERNEST RIBBS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

A SUPERB NEW TEXT
CICERO'S ORATIONS

Edited by

Walter B. Gunnison, Ph.D., Principal, and Walter S. Harley, A.M., Instructor in Latin, Erasmus Hall High School.

This is the most complete, most richly illustrated edition of Cicero ever published for school use. Many of its illustrations have never before appeared in a school text. It contains the required orations; a Grammatical Appendix; Prose Composition and Sight Reading Selections. 543 pp. \$1.25.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
231 West 39th Street

NEW YORK CITY

The Back Volumes of
THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

MAY BE SECURED
BY WRITING TO

Professor Charles Knapp

Barnard College, NEW YORK CITY

A Limited Number of Sets remains.
Price \$1.00 Per Volume.

For Third Year Sight Reading

SELECTIONS FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CICERO

Edited by J. C. KIRTLAND, Professor of Latin, Phillips Exeter Academy.

Price, 50 cents

Contains selections from the letters of Cicero best suited for sight reading. The introduction, brief foot-notes, and the marking of all long vowels have been done with particular reference to the purpose of the volume.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
New York Cincinnati Chicago

ELEMENTS OF LATIN

By Barry C. Smith, The Browning School, New York.

A book containing many new and attractive features and embodying in a marked degree the point of view of secondary school teaching. Cloth. 360 pages. \$1.00

LATIN WORD FORMATION

By Paul R. Jenks, Flushing High School, New York City. The first attempt to treat the subject of Latin word formation in a manner adapted to the needs of secondary schools. Cloth. 86 pages. 50 cents

LATIN DRILL AND COMPOSITION

By Ernest D. Daniels, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. This little volume offers the opportunity for thorough daily drill in the forms and constructions found in the first four books of the Gallic War. Cloth. 125 pages. 40 cents.

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY
BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

**Abbott's History and Description
of Roman Political Institutions**

introduces the high-school or college student to the monarchial, republican, and imperial periods of Roman history. The book is unique in treatment, flexible in plan, and contains helpful references and bibliographies.

Third Edition - - - Price : \$1.50

GINN AND COMPANY
70 Fifth Avenue New York

Notes at the Foot of the Study Page

Try this plan with any pupil however backward. See if his work does not improve. All these texts are based on this plan:

Walker's Caesar	-	{ 4 book edition, \$1.00 7 book edition, 1.25
Miller and Beeson's Second Latin Book	-	1.25
Johnston and Kingery's Cicero	{ 6 Orations, 1.00 10 " " 1.25	
Knapp's Vergil	-	1.40

A separate text is supplied free for recitation.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
623 So. Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill. : 460 Fourth Ave., New York

